(3) UP 2015

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR

CHHATTISGARH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3853 OF 2004

PETITIONERS :

1. Venkat Rao Sahare, S/O Late Shri Limbaji Sahare, Aged about 30 years, Presently posted as Constable - Old No.363 (New 670), Police Station Genda Tola, District Rajnandgaon (C.G.).

2. Amrit Lal Bisen, S/O Shri Punaji Bisen, Aged about 34 years, Presently posted as Constable - Old No.828 (New 537), Police Station Genda Tola, District Rajnandgaon (C.G.).

P.R. No. 3855/04 Presented by Shri Saqueen Behar dated 12/10/04

Versus

RESPONDENTS :

1. Union of India
Through the Secretary, Department of Personnel, Public Grievance and Pension, Third Floor, Lok Nayak Bhawan, Khan Market, New Delhi.

2. State of Madhya Pradesh
Through the Secretary, Department of Home Affairs, Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal (M.P.).

3. State of Chhattisgarh
Through the Secretary, Department of Home Affairs, D.K.S. Building, Mantralaya, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

4. Director General of Police, State of Chhattisgarh, Raipur (C.G.).

RECEIVED COPY 12/10/04 Clerk to A. G. Bilaspur

R/c Shri Yadav 12.10.04 Clerk to Shri VINAY HARIT Senior Central Government Standing Counsel CHHATTISGARH HIGH COURT

5

2

(4)

5. Inspector General of Police (Personnel), Police Head Quarters, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.).

6. Superintendent of Police, District Rajnandgaon (C.G.).

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

5

(62)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE MR. SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION NO.3853 OF 2004

Petitioners : Venkat Rao Sahare and another

versus

Respondents : Union of India and others

Present : Mr. B.D.Guru, counsel for the petitioners.
Mr. S.K.Beriwal, counsel for respondent No.1.
Mr. Rajeev Shrivastava, counsel for respondent No.2.
Mr. V.V.S.Moorthy, Deputy Advocate General with Mr. Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer for the State of Chhattisgarh/respondents No.3, 4, 5 and 6.

ORDER

(Passed on 1st Day of February, 2007)

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the writ petition has become infructuous.

2. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed as having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Gopal